| **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 311** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you support a standardized data structure and schema for WHOIS responses?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 55 | 82.09% |  |
| No (N) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| No answer | 5 | 7.46% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/4bda35d5675f6039d0cf558f8facf46d.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 312** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you support a formal extension framework order so that WHOIS implementers may add additional data elements to the standard data structure and schema for WHOIS responses?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 48 | 71.64% |  |
| No (N) | 8 | 11.94% |  |
| No answer | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/397cb5dfad1549a4226fc69551322b4c.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 313** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure allow for interpretation or output of WHOIS responses to non-English or non-Latin languages/scripts?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 47 | 70.15% |  |
| No (N) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| No answer | 16 | 23.88% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/3ee74ab8f34e0c46b9dbc1d2d6c486e5.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 314** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 25 | 53.19% |  |
| No (N) | 18 | 38.30% |  |
| No answer | 4 | 8.51% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/57df6c252d74f9f434c04203ac02db78.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 315** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If No please recommend (with reasons) another more suitable mechanism for interpretation or WHOIS responses** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 1 | 25.00% |  |
| No answer | 3 | 75.00% |  |
| **Responses** As a registrar we have already problems to read/understand some IDN. How should we read/verify a domainname's data if we cannot understand it (for example to ensure the WDRP)? standard As all sections of the RAA, WHOIS data should be required to be in English. i think English is an Universal language. not needed | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/d127314e2f8a6ad591dd1139177f1d29.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 316** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure be flexible to allow humans to interpret it (should it be directly human readable or require machine interpretation)?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 54 | 80.60% |  |
| No (N) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| No answer | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/5e32b170bcfe55e621ff6d7b85ab5559.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 317** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure be optimized to allow programs to parse  it?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 49 | 73.13% |  |
| No (N) | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| No answer | 8 | 11.94% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/1caa9d47ca6960b7ff9f6d2168e9f7a3.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 318** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Should the data structure be XML based** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 32 | 47.76% |  |
| No (N) | 15 | 22.39% |  |
| No answer | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/9af9844c2b6173d1d576afb87593ae4f.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 319** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If No, please recommend with reasons another more suitable data structure** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 10 | 66.67% |  |
| No answer | 5 | 33.33% |  |
| **Responses** Plain text multiple formats While I don't entirely disagree with the use of XML, I think some other options should be avaliable. For example, a simple .csv format with first record field names could be a fine and simple format. I'm not in favor of machine-readable whois - it will encourage spam json is better suited The current way registries do it is easy. Name value pairs like Registrant Name: Joe Smith XML has its advantages, but is complex. A whois scheme should be as simple as possible. Imho. Allows Commercialization JSON is better. ewafds XML is heavyweight and inefficient, not sure what best alternative is. JSON, please XML is not human readable. XML is hard to read. json plz?  We recommend JSON. The IETF WEIRDS working group has settled on JSON, and we support that effort. | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/b5344d33b8f2137bf556273cd7f8dd44.png | | | |