| **Results** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of records in this query:** | 67 |
| **Total records in survey:** | 67 |
| **Percentage of total:** | 100.00% |

Top of Form



Bottom of Form

| **Field summary for 1011** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you support a standard, formal, extensible data structure and schema for WHOWAS responses?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 37 | 55.22% |  |
| No (N) | 14 | 20.90% |  |
| No answer | 16 | 23.88% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/f1de3404bbb6f71e846251bd5be66a6e.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1012** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should all standard WHOIS data elements be included for WHOWAS responses?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 35 | 52.24% |  |
| No (N) | 17 | 25.37% |  |
| No answer | 15 | 22.39% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/30944f7db0697a851803b64d40686815.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1013** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure allow for interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses to non-English or non-Latin languages?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 38 | 56.72% |  |
| No (N) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| No answer | 25 | 37.31% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/1eb1f8a880ffa82a80f16c190791756f.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1014** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If Yes, should this interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses be based on localization of the client software?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 23 | 60.53% |  |
| No (N) | 12 | 31.58% |  |
| No answer | 3 | 7.89% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/3b6d8bb93b7b4005bf9daf3159c4719b.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1016** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If No please recommend with reasons another more suitable mechanism for this interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 4 | 100.00% |  |
| No answer | 0 | 0.00% |  |
| **Responses** WHOWAS should be extremely limited in scope. WHOIS should implement the right to be forgotten. No, no automated tools. None Make them machine parsable and clients can translate it | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/b512c78c2bb7fd859b28493ed1dd7359.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1015** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure be flexible for humans to interpret?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 42 | 62.69% |  |
| No (N) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| No answer | 19 | 28.36% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/fc45b09a1c74bb23428de29b01522e5b.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1017** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure be XML based?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 26 | 38.81% |  |
| No (N) | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| No answer | 30 | 44.78% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/b9713ad4305d81af841315a919598778.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1019** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If No please, recommend with reasons another more suitable data structure** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 11 | 100.00% |  |
| No answer | 0 | 0.00% |  |
| **Responses** Plain text multiple formats Same as earlier answer. No, no automated tools. Any structured format is acceptable (eg JSON). However, XML has some benefits such as schemas and XSLT, although these are not unique to XML. Just not ASN1 :-) json, please, same as WEIRDS None Again, JSON is easier and better Because there are other formats. JSON, please XML is not human readable. The data structure should not be only XML based but it should include also ASCII structure.  json plz | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/0947bcd4fe1d2b3a34156a2b73091195.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1020** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should there be a limited retention period for WHOWAS?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 23 | 34.33% |  |
| No (N) | 21 | 31.34% |  |
| No answer | 23 | 34.33% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/3abb313a484ed528c6cb72598bce3ec0.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 1021** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If Yes,what should be the retention range?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| 6 months (1) | 7 | 30.43% |  |
| 1 year (2) | 1 | 4.35% |  |
| 2 years (3) | 2 | 8.70% |  |
| 5 years (4) | 3 | 13.04% |  |
| Other, Please specify with reasonUSE: Text Field, limit 140 characters (5) | 4 | 17.39% |  |
| Duration is configurable (6) | 6 | 26.09% |  |
| Comments | 7 | 30.43% |  |
| No answer | 0 | 0.00% |  |
| **'Other' Responses** the lifetime of the previous registration, or 1 year, whichever is longer. 60 days for the duration of the registration, plus a few years Defined in RFC 1459 is should be retained but not returned to the average user (user that are not law enforcement for example) more of balancing business interests and privacy/propriety 6 years or other local legal compliance | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/186bd2e3a3db1cdeca73531bf1c162e6.png | | | |